CITY OF ISSAQUAH WASHINGTON

Community Planning & Development
1775 – 12th Ave. NW | P.O. Box 1307
Issaquah, WA 98027
425-837-3100
issaquahwa.gov

Date: July 27, 2020

To: Development Commission

CC: Tom Mullins, Issaquah School District

From: Cristina Haworth, Planning Consultant
Lucy Sloman, Land Development Manager

Subject: Public Comment Summary for **Issaquah School District High School No. 4 & Elementary School No. 17**
Community Conference: COM20-00001; PRJ19-00008

Attachments:
1. Public comments received via e-mail between July 3, 2020 and July 22, 2020

This memorandum summarizes comments and questions raised at the Development Commission's July 15, 2020 Community Conference. The following topics are addressed:

Contents

About the Community Conference

A community conference is an informal public meeting hosted by the Development Commission prior to submittal of the required Master Site Plan application for the proposal. The purpose of the meeting is to "generate discussion, raise issues, and propose creative options relative to the proposed project" according to IMC 18.04.140(A), and is intended to facilitate a positive working relationship between the Applicant, City staff, the Development Commission, and the public. The community conference is an early opportunity to identify concerns, challenges, and design alternatives but issues raised at the community conference may not be all inclusive. The community conference is a fact-finding effort but is not a project application. Design changes and project decisions are not made at the community conference.

Because the community conference is an early opportunity for input, the level of detail in the information provided is less than the level of detail provided with the Master Site Plan application. Additional project detail, including a response to public input, will be provided with the Master Site Plan application submittal.

The community conference for this project was held on July 15, 2020 via remote (virtual) meeting platforms. Written comments on the community conference content were accepted through July 23, 2020 for incorporation into this summary. Written comments received after July 22, 2020 are still accepted by the City but are not included in this summary; they will be provided to the Applicant and the Development Commission for consideration with the Master Site Plan application.

Public Comment Summary

Staff has summarized public comments received via email and in verbal comment on the record at the community conference. Staff and the Applicant (Issaquah School District; ISD) have provided responses. Staff has provided a conclusion. Related topics are grouped beneath a header and each topic is numbered for future reference only as will all the comments on which this summary and response memo.

It should be noted that this process in documenting the community conference comments and requiring applicant and staff responses is not required by IMC. The responses provided by the applicant are made based on current information available and intended to continue the community discussions regarding the project. These responses are not intended to provide additional project requirements beyond those outlined by the IMC and explicitly agreed to by ISD as part of their forthcoming land use applications.

Procedural Comments and Questions

1. The materials provided with the application lack sufficient detail for meaningful public comment. What are the submittal requirements for a community conference, and do ISD's materials satisfy it?
2. Public notice was inadequate. Notices were mailed to previous property owners and current property owners did not receive notices. Notices should have been mailed more broadly, given the magnitude of the project. What information was used to send out the required notices?
3. A remote (virtual) meeting format is inappropriate for the nature of the community conference. A remote (virtual) meeting format does not offer adequate opportunity for dialogue and may preclude participation by those unfamiliar with digital meeting platforms

and other necessary technology. The Development Commission, staff, and the Applicant were able to exchange ideas, the public was only able to present questions and thoughts, not dialogue.

4. Limiting the amount of time and number of possible commenters is in conflict with the intent of the community conference. Significant community interaction makes a project better; when the public doesn't show up, a community conference is a failure.
5. Application documents are difficult to access, navigate, and examine online. It is unclear if all application documents are available online or if there is information that is not posted. The scale of the renderings was inadequate to understand the project details.
6. Why is the level of detail required with this application different than the level of detail required with applications in other parts of Issaquah?
7. This project is being fast-tracked with inadequate environmental review and mitigation.
8. Consideration of any administrative adjustments of standards (AASs) and/or variances should be consolidated with the master site plan (MSP) and site development permit (SDP) applications for a hearing before the Development Commission and a decision by the City Council.
9. What are the applicable codes for this project? Please provide a code interpretation.
10. The public process appears to be a charade and the project is being fast-tracked and/or rubber-stamped for approval.
11. The process is flawed; ISD is sheltered from direct questions from the Development Commission and the public. The process provides no avenue to discuss and resolve areas of disagreement and concern. Development Commission and members of the public are at a disadvantage because they lack expertise or access to expertise and must rely on partisan professionals to field and answer questions. ISD's priorities are driving the plan and process while legitimate concerns are ignored or dismissed.
12. How can ISD dismiss feedback that is inconsistent with their vision of what the project should include and how its elements will be organized on the site? ISD was dismissive of comments, questions, and suggestions offered by the Development Commission and the public. Public input appears to be seen as an obstacle instead of an opportunity.

Staff Response:

Applicant Response: The District defers to City staff to respond the questions in this category related to the Community Conference procedures, code requirements, and notice obligations. However, as a general response, IMC 18.04.140 sets for the requirements for a Community Conference related to Master Site Plan application. The District's pre-conference submittal met all required code provisions for holding the Community Conference. As an informal conference designed to provide pre-application project input, there is no required minimum submittal requirements and is not intended to be inclusive of all options and issues. Keeping the public safe during a pandemic while meeting the guidelines and City requirements for a Community Conference has been paramount to developing this virtual Community Conference. ISD and the design team worked together with the City to ensure that all submittal materials met the requirements, were provided on time and were accurate. The City provided open access to the virtual meeting and posted relevant documents for public review. The District responded at the Community Conference to questions from the Development Commission and comments and questions from the public and provides additional responses herein.

The City went above and beyond the requirements in IMC 18.04.140 to provide an additional week following the Community Conference for the public to submit additional comments and

also in providing this response to comments and questions (neither the additional comment period nor the response are required under IMC 18.04.140). The District views the both comments expressed at the live Community Conference and the additional comment period as helpful for purposes of informing its continuing design work.

We appreciated the discussion with the community and Development Commission to help further this project and look forward to collaborating further with the Design Commission and public going forward.

Conclusion:

General Project Questions and Comments

13. What is the anticipated project timeline moving forward from the Community Conference?
14. A new high school is critical and should be accelerated as quickly as possible.
15. Is a new elementary school really necessary with so many elementary schools in the area and elementary school #16 under construction?
16. Why not buy the property for schools before the residences that would use them are built?
17. How is the project consistent with the Issaquah Comprehensive Plan and with Issaquah's community values and goals, including environmental stewardship?
18. ISD has a responsibility to ensure the project achieves high standards, including economic efficiency, safety, aesthetics, and minimum impact on the environment and adjacent property owners.
19. ISD should work with and reach a mutual agreement with the Providence Point community and other adjacent neighbors. The Providence Point community feels it has not been treated respectfully in negotiations. The Providence Point community feels ISD did not work in good faith to resolve concerns or mitigate impacts. School district officials do not appear to have made any substantive changes to the plans based on two years of feedback from the surrounding communities.
20. The purpose of the schools should focus on academics, rather than sports. Has ISD considered focusing the high school curriculum on STEM and/or STEAM and/or environmental studies/sciences? STEM and environmental sciences sectors are poised for faster than average growth in employment. This could allow elimination of the stadium, reducing noise and lighting impacts and increasing the buffer between the school buildings and the Providence Point community. An example is Lake Washington School District's STEM high school (https://tesla.lwsd.org/). A focus on environmental studies could allow most of the site to be used for outdoor laboratories, facilitate study of climate change, and generate ideas to combat ecological impacts. Outdoor laboratories could be used by other schools in the district.
21. The project does not use land efficiently and has shown disregard for invaluable environmental features on the site. The access roads, stadium, bus depot, and sports plazas use up a lot of valuable land. The elementary school and high school have mutually exclusive outdoor facilities and land could be more efficiently used by locating an elementary and middle school together.
22. It is inappropriate to put very young children on the same campus as high schoolers. Elementary school students may be exposed to inappropriate behavior, language, habits, etc. Inexperienced high school drivers may pose a safety risk to elementary school students. Clear documentation demonstrating safety for all students should be required before allowing these two schools to be co-located.

23. The project should consider not only the adjacent Providence Point and Bellewood communities, but also the nearby rehabilitation, assisted living, and memory care facilities.
24. The coronavirus/COVID-19 pandemic has caused disruption to primary education and may result in permanent, radical changes related to distance learning and virtual platforms. What impact has this (or should this) new reality have on the project design? Are assumptions for enrollment still valid? It may be more prudent to consider this thoroughly before moving forward with project design, permitting, and construction. The design team should consider the cost-effectiveness of building in accommodations such as easily moveable walls to facilitate rearrangement of classrooms, circulation systems that allow for the installation of advanced air filtration, and similar measures that allow a nimble response to the pandemic.
25. The schools should be purpose-built with remote learning infrastructure. This could include, but is not limited to, smaller buildings for two- to three-day classroom instruction that can be rotated to allow cleaning, for example.
26. How will events and other off-hours use of the site impact Providence Point and how will noise and lighting impacts associated with off-hours use be mitigated?
27. The 3D rendering overstates the landscaping on the site and lack perspectives from Providence Point to understand how the school project will impact them.
28. Property values and property taxes in Providence Point are and will continue to be impacted by the project. How will these impacts be mitigated? The school district should buy out property owners.
29. The application materials need to address applicable Comprehensive Plan policies, including compact schools, helping schools plan for growth, and connecting schools to surrounding areas via trails and non-motorized modes.
30. The project, located in one of the most innovative regions in the country, looks back instead of ahead.
31. There are no single family residences or apartments at Providence Point. As a 55+ community, no children live here and all units are owned. There are midrise buildings with multiple units but there are no apartments.

Staff Response:

Applicant Response:

The direction from the voters and school board has been to provide a comprehensive high school similar to the other high schools in the district and to get it completed as soon as possible to reduce existing overcrowding at the other high schools and provide the needed capacity to serve ongoing residential growth in the district. The district plans to begin construction in 2021 on the project with the primary focus being getting the high school completed and open for use. The project has worked to achieve a safe, secure, and high-quality school for the students within the project budget. The design of the new site has been laid out to share infrastructure and access between the two schools to minimize construction costs as well as provide buffers with program features maintain separation between the two schools. The high school track and field, tennis courts, elementary school service area, and the road between the two uses provide these buffers. Throughout the design process it was confirmed that a single building for each school is more cost efficient to build and maintain than multiple smaller buildings, and additionally furthers and facilitates school security. The schools will be equipped with infrastructure to allow internet access and remote teaching as necessary in today's learning environments. While the district is contemporaneously planning for learning needs during the pandemic, it also needs to plan for school capacity that will be needed beyond

the pandemic. At this time no plans for an alternative style high school are proposed in the district.

ISD is committed to community use of the facilities and as a result intends to allow scheduled community access to the track as well as scheduled community use of the buildings and fields. This access will be limited to times outside school use and controlled by the district. The facility lights onsite will be able to be used by the community during hours outside of school use. This is allowed in an effort to facilitate more public use of the facilities by extending the time past sundown in which they can be used. The exact hours of permitted community access are still being discussed.

The planned new elementary school is necessary to meet the District's growth-related capacity needs. Currently, the District has a permanent K-5 capacity of 8,242 in permanent facilities (with additional capacity in portable facilities) in 15 elementary schools. October 2019 K-5 enrollment shows a total of 9,383 students in the District. By the 2030 school year, the District projects K-5 enrollment at a total of 10,118 students. The District's K-5 student population is currently over housed and, without additional capacity, the problem will worsen. The addition of Elementary No. 16 will help to address some but not all of those needs. Elementary No. 17 is needed to address additional needs and needs within the service area surrounding the school.

The District is committed to working with the neighbors in the surrounding communities, including Providence Point, in attempts to address concerns and provide updated and accurate project information. As noted in public materials, the District engaged in settlement discussions prior to the Council's decision on the Comprehensive Plan redesignation and rezone and also in structured mediation with the Providence Point Umbrella Association in the current Growth Management Hearings Board proceedings. While no settlement was reached in either proceeding, the District directed modifications to the design to provide buffers that exceed minimum requirements for the zone (in some areas by considerable amounts). Additional berming and landscaping was added beyond code requirements in areas we understand to be the highest in terms of view concerns. Further, tree retention and landscaping that exceed minimum code requirements, and orientating buildings and facilities in a manner designed to minimize impacts to surrounding properties was also done. These modifications were incorporated into the site plan in recent months as the District heard and received input.

The co-location of school facilities is common in the Puget Sound Region, particularly as developable urban land is scarce. In the Issaquah School District, Issaquah High School and Issaquah Middle School share a common campus immediately adjacent to the Clark Elementary School and Gibson Ek High School campus. Other area school districts with shared high school and elementary campuses include Auburn School District (Auburn High School and Washington Elementary School on a 37 acre campus), Bellevue School District (Interlake High School, Evergreen Transition Program, and Sherwood Forrest Elementary School on a 48 acre campus), Fife School District (Fife High School and the new Fife Elementary School on a 29 acre campus), Mercer Island School District (Mercer Island High School, Northwood Elementary School, Crest Learning Center, and the District's Administration Center on a 39 acre campus), and Renton School District (Lindbergh High School and Renton Park Elementary School on a 37 acre campus).

Comments related to property values are non-design/code compliant matters. However, the District is unaware of any studies or documented reports that support statements that property values and property taxes in Providence Point "are and will continue to be impacted by the project." We understand that the two commenters who provided these statements subsequently clarified that the statements were individual opinions. Attached is an opinion of Pete Hayes of Coldwell Banker Bain that shows a net positive effect with regard to recent property values for Providence Point properties.

Additional information including renderings will be included in the Master Site Plan and Site Development Plan applications being submitted to the City. The renderings provided for the Community Conference were not intended and could not, as site design is refined, show all elements of the site

Conclusion:

State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)

32. What is the status of project-level SEPA? The community anticipates an environmental impact statement (EIS) to be prepared, based on discussions during the rezone process.
33. The City of Issaquah (or another non-partisan agency) should act as/remain as Lead Agency for the project-level SEPA and it should be performed by a qualified outside consultant. It is a conflict of interest for ISD to perform its own SEPA review.
34. The City Council decision on the rezone SEPA appeal indicated that City staff was to be the reviewer for environmental compliance.
35. Neither the City nor ISD can perform an objective environmental review of the project.
36. Environmental information, including the checklist and threshold determination, should be available immediately; according to WAC 197-11-055, project-level SEPA should be completed at the earliest possible point in the planning and decision-making process. Waiting until 14 days prior to the public hearing or City Council decision is disingenuous.
37. The SEPA process for the rezone lacked transparency and was misleading regarding the extent of plans for the site, which had been developed by ISD at that time. The rezone SEPA was determined "adequate" because the City lacked project-level information; materials submitted for the community conference, however, are dated June 2019 and ISD had a pre-application meeting with the City in August 2019. The City's SEPA should have been project-level.
38. The SEPA process for the rezone included other parcels that are significantly smaller than the ISD property and the ISD property should have had a specific, focused review.

Staff Response:

Applicant Response: The District is acting as lead agency for purpose of environmental review of the project under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). The SEPA regulations anticipate that the District, as the public agency initiating the project, will act as the lead agency for purposes of SEPA. See WAC 197-11-924 and WAC 197-11-926. Contrary to submitted comments, the City Council's decision on the SEPA Appeal on the Comprehensive Plan redesignation and rezone did not require that the City be lead agency for purpose of project-level review. The referenced comment misconstrues a finding related to the Council's recognition of the appropriateness of phased review. Notably, there is nothing in that Decision that directs or requires the City to be lead agency for the project-level review. The transcripts to both the SEPA appeal and the Council's deliberation on the redesignation/rezone decision

make clear that the Council understood that the District intended to act as lead agency for purposes of project-level review. See SEPA Appeal transcript (December 2, 2019 and December 5, 2019) (Testimony of Keith Niven at page 71-72; Council deliberations at p. 213, 247, and 261) and the transcript from December 16, 2019 Council deliberations on the redesignation and rezone. Nonetheless, as an affected agency under SEPA and the permitting jurisdiction, the City will have the opportunity to provide comments regarding the SEPA threshold determination. WAC 197-11-340(2). In addition, the District is going a step further with this project and seeking input from the City on the draft SEPA Checklist and supporting documents in order to inform the threshold determination. The District expects to issue the SEPA threshold determination in the coming weeks.
Conclusion:

Site Design

39. The site design lacks sensitivity to the Providence Point community/quality of life and causes vehicular pollution, noise, and lighting impacts. The site plan falsely implies adequate buffers between the site and Providence Point and the application does not make it clear that the 60-foot buffer is an average. The site layout puts the vulnerable senior population at risk including by idling vehicles 30-50 ft from vulnerable populations.
40. ISD should meet the minimum FAR required by the compact schools regulations. Falling well short of the minimum FAR indicates a very inefficient use of the property for educational purposes.
41. An option to meet the minimum FAR is to adjust property boundaries, building the school in the central clearing that exists on the site and protecting the rest of the property as open space. For example, the Providence Heights College fit all its facilities into 210,000 square feet and preserved most of the remaining site area. This is more consistent with the character of the surrounding community.
42. It is unclear if the portables are included in the FAR calculations. Why can the project not meet FAR requirements but the site plan identifies areas for additions and portables? Why is the project being planned with the assumption of adding portables in the future instead of accommodating projected enrollment now? Expansion of the school(s) with future additions and/or portables is unreasonable.
43. Removal of the stadium would allow a larger school, resulting in better compliance with the FAR.
44. FAR should be increased by providing additional classrooms, laboratories, and workshops for trade classes.
45. Considering outdoor sports facilities as “academic curriculum” doesn’t make sense or fulfill the need for more classroom space.
46. Preserved vegetation along 228th Avenue SE should not be considered “academic curriculum.” The traffic, invasive species (blackberries), steep slopes, and few remaining mature trees make this a poor learning environment.
47. The site is inadequately sized. Not only is the gross site area smaller than the typical needs for a high school, at least five acres are undevelopable given existing slopes and wetlands, leaving only 35 acres available for the project. Washington state guidelines indicate a preferred minimum site of 48 acres for an 1,800-student high school. Albuquerque guidelines require 10 acres for elementary schools and 45-50 acres for high schools. Skyline High School is on 50 acres.
48. The site design appears to fit too many elements into a site that is too small. The site size is exacerbated by the topographical challenges, making it difficult to provide adequate

buffers along the perimeter with Providence Point. The Issaquah Planning & Policy Commission urged ISD to scale down the project.

49. The conceptual site graphics indicate a "regenerating forest" area in the center of the property but the site plan shows this to be a parking lot.
50. The property ingress/egress should be moved northward on 228th Avenue SE to create a straight line from the intersection into the site, allowing the internal access road to be located behind the baseball diamond right field fence. This will improve vehicular safety.
51. The internal access road should be moved southward to provide additional separation between site traffic and adjacent retirement communities.
52. Consider building only a large elementary school with playgrounds that will have adequate classroom space for future elementary school needs. This would reduce traffic, lighting, and noise impacts.
53. The elementary school is located as far as possible from 228th Avenue SE and small children will be unable to walk to school, making it accessible only by car or bus.
54. The site design, including clearing and grading, aesthetics, utilities, etc., should reflect current best practices for environmental protection, climate change, and enlightened technological choices.
55. Building "extra" parking now for future growth in enrollment lacks common sense; the project should be built to maximize classrooms first. Could student parking be reduced or eliminated? Could student parking be used as an incentive, for example only allowing parking spaces for those with high GPAs, those who carpool, or those who volunteer in the community?
56. Extensive internal access roadways use valuable land, reduce curriculum-related spaces, and increase project expenses while draining bond funds. This is an inefficient use of taxpayer money. Was the bond for classrooms or did it also disclose and identify that there would be a stadium with the high school?
57. Can the footprint of the large parking structure be minimized to allow more flexibility in siting other programmatic elements, especially the stadium and elementary school? Can the parking structure include an additional level either above or below the current design to reduce the footprint?
58. Based on Heffron's Technical Memo, it sounds like the plan expects neighbors not to drive during start and stop times of the school. That's ridiculous.
59. The Heffron Technical Memo also indicates that there could be special events using up to the 759 parking spaces available onsite?
60. Any fencing along the property line shared with Providence Point should not be chain-link. Any fencing should be aesthetically pleasing. A high wall that cannot be scaled (for security purposes) could be an option.
61. The site design does not reflect or respect the quiet, contemplative atmosphere intended by the Sisters of Providence. The site is dominated by sports facilities.

Staff Response:

Applicant Response: The School Site is located on 40+ acres inside the urban area. The site is not encumbered and has never been encumbered by any covenants or overlay criteria that would require clearing limitations or specific site designs. While the adjacent residential properties are densely developed with minimal buffers, the School Site will retain landscape perimeter buffering and provide landscaping in excess of minimum code requirements. This buffer is intended to mitigate noise, light, and view impacts from the project. Onsite fencing will

be used to define the program areas and discourage use (from bon onsite and offsite) of unsupervised areas within the buffer.

ISD intends to work with the City to meet the intent of the FAR by compressing site uses to the maximum extent feasible. The proposed program requirements for the school, limitations on road access to the site, topography, parking requirements, and tree retention requirements from the City all make meeting the FAR requirements as currently written nearly impossible for the project without adding additional building area to the project and creating budget challenges. All proposed additions of classroom space have been included in the FAR to date. Any reduction to the number of schools or outdoor educational program space to the project will further reduce the project's ability to meet the compact schools and FAR requirements. The proposed classroom space for this project has not been reduced in any manner because of the outdoor educational spaces. The building program has been designed to maximize efficiency of space which has resulted in square footage reductions to save cost, not reduce the program. It should also be noted that multiple options for structured parking have been reviewed during the design and the two story layout was found to best fit site topography, minimize inefficiency caused by additional ramping for more stories, and minimize construction costs since the requirement for structured parking was not in place when the project budget was set as part of the bond planning.

The site layout utilizes access onto 228th Ave that has been located to provide intersection spacing from 40th Ave to the north, utilize existing access road clearing and grading, and balance the connection elevation with access to the site. The road bend was added to provide additional length needed to traverse the 70-feet of topography change from the access to the high school building and meet the City's requirements for vehicular and ADA access. Proposed site improvements include utilities and parking to accommodate future additions to avoid future construction impacts and additional cost associated with these improvements. The project proposes approximately 759 event parking spaces on the site by utilizing drop off areas and other school program spaces for special events.

The report used real traffic counts to model the existing traffic on the site and predict the impacts the school traffic will have on the surrounding area. The traffic information collected showed less traffic during the school dismissal times than other typical peaks. The report does not rely on and there is no plan to reduce other traffic in the area.

The site orientation places the elementary school in the back of the site for a number of reasons but primarily to anticipate the queuing length for the drop-off and pickup times, avoiding backups onto 228th Ave or inhibiting access to the high school, position the track and field away from neighboring property boundaries, and the desire to maintain separation between the elementary and high school programs. As required by code frontage ,improvements including bike paths and sidewalks will be constructed and connect to onsite travel paths allowing for streamlined access to both schools and the outdoor education program elements. The nearest existing sidewalks and public transit stops on 228th Ave. are approximately ¼ from the project limits.

Conclusion:

Building Design and Aesthetics

62. How will the project elements along the Providence Point community be aesthetically treated to avoid a “back alley view” for adjacent residents?
63. The scale of the proposed buildings, such as the high school with its bulky mass of 50 ft in height, is not comparable to community facilities such as the Clubhouse, Indoor Pool, Café, Apartment building, Fitness Center and tennis courts.
64. The project should be designed to maximize classroom space and minimize future expansions/portables. This would more appropriately address overcrowding in schools. In particular, the high school is inadequately sized and should be designed with more classroom space, taking into consideration whichever academic emphasis the school will be distinguished by (perhaps health or the environment)). This will complement the STEM and International Baccalaureate programs at other ISD schools.
65. Why is ISD not seeking green building certification? Is it for budget-saving reasons? Will the schools meet the Washington Sustainable School Protocol (WSSP) or LEED Certification required for any future state funding? The project should achieve green building certification and should incorporate proven, environmentally sound design and construction practices. The design team should consider solar panels, water capture and recycle systems, heat pumps instead of traditional HVAC, and other measures that will result in environmentally responsible structures.
66. Details on building exteriors, including material colors and textures and screening elements, should be provided. The level of detail should match that expected from projects in Central Issaquah.
67. The building appears too industrial/institutional and does not fit in with the architecture of the surrounding community. The basic architectural styles differ significantly and are comparatively severe. The materials are monochromatic and dark and do not respond well to surrounding materials and finishes. The materials evoke a sense of downtown office buildings and municipal utility and wastewater facilities. The walls look blank.
68. Will dark materials result in added heat absorption? Lighter materials would be better.
69. The elementary school playground is surrounded by the three-story school building, the back of the stadium, and residential garages in Providence Point. The students will feel like they are in a chasm when playing outside. Additionally, noise from car, bus, and service vehicle traffic will be amplified by the buildings and will negatively impact the learning and play experiences of the elementary school students. This elementary school will be undesirable when compared to other district schools.
70. The building architecture is unremarkable and could pass easily as a warehouse or other industrial use.
71. “Bark-like” materials are not adequate compensation for the loss of so many trees on the site.
72. How will the rooftop mechanical equipment be screened? Will this be by landscape or building components?

Staff Response:
Applicant Response: The design provides an average 60’ wide landscaped buffer adjacent to the Providence Point property. A mix of existing trees, new trees, shrubs and grading will be provided. The edges of the elementary school site provide sloped landscaping, with a fence and a playground to the east. To the southwest, the existing wetlands and many trees are preserved. To the south, much of the existing access road is removed and replaced with site retaining walls and terraced landscaping. The proposed high school is three stories in height and the elementary school is a combination of two and three stories. Providence Point appears

to have rows of three-story buildings lining 224th Lane SE and 226th Place SE along with one building to the north that appears to be four and, in some cases, five stories tall. Thus, the height of the proposed schools is similar to those of Providence Point's adjacent facilities.

The high school is meeting, and exceeding, the Washington Sustainable Schools Protocol (WSSP) requirements. The WSSP is the State's adopted green building standard for school buildings. Additionally, the project is required to address the City's sustainable building goals outlined in the IMC and the 2017 Building Action Strategy. The design team, owner and design build contractor participated in several sustainability sessions that informed decisions regarding energy efficient HVAC and electrical systems, building orientation, building materials and storm water management. The elementary school is not eligible for state funding and is not required to meet WSSP, however, the same sustainable discussions informed the design of this school. One key point for sustainable design is to consider effects of heat absorption and heat island effect on the project. The roofing material and color would potentially have the greatest impact on these. The high school and elementary school will use a white, thermoplastic polyolefin (TPO) roofing material that will minimize the heat absorption on the roof. The exterior walls are a vented rainscreen so the material color does not play a significant role in thermal performance.

The elementary school building defines just the north side of the playground. The west and south edges are defined by planted buffers and the track and field is over 100' away to the east. The play areas include covered play structures, landscaped terraces and a play field. A positive playground experience for the elementary school students will be created through the playground design and amenities provided.

The Community Conference submittal does not require in depth material boards but it does require exterior building elevations and an exterior material board. Both of these items were submitted. The design team has aimed to design a building which creates a visually interesting façade while keeping the building massing simple. This allows the project to afford things like landscape buffers above and beyond the code minimum. The existing site is surrounded by a dense growth of trees with a clearing in the middle. The siting of the high school, at the south end of the clearing, does not attempt to mimic the trees but instead provide shelter within an urban forest. The building materials and color palette compliments the subdued colors and textures of the pacific northwest forests. Additional details regarding the building will be included in future permit submittals.

As required by IMC, rooftop mechanical equipment will be screened with metal wall panels that surround and shield the vertical faces of the mechanical units. All units are on the roof.

Conclusion:

Safety and Site Access

73. Will school children be able to access the Providence Point community? How will access be controlled by ISD and how will ISD prevent students from entering the Providence Point community? Will extra security be hired during sports events?
74. Will the campus be closed and secured at night?
75. How will the access road be secured to prevent students from walking through it?

76. What is the purpose of the small drive that connects to the southern property line? How will it be secured?

Staff Response:

Applicant Response: It is the intent of the ISD to operate this school similar to other schools in the district. Onsite fencing will be used to define the program areas and discourage use (from both onsite and offsite) of unsupervised areas within the buffer. The existing chain link fence (approximately 6 feet in height) will remain around the perimeter of the school site. The internal access road is being removed and revegetated. The campus will be monitored by security cameras and closed following school and community use of the facilities. At this time vehicular access to the site will be centrally located and the existing southern road is intended for emergency vehicle access only and will be gated to limit entry.

Conclusion:

Stadium and Sports Fields

77. Is a stadium necessary? There are existing sports facilities, including the recently-renovated football stadium, at nearby schools that could be shared. There are numerous examples regionally and nationally for sharing sports facilities between schools within a district.
78. Elimination of the stadium from the scope of work would allow reallocation of funds to provide additional classrooms, laboratories, workshops for trade classes, and improved stormwater treatment or similar improvements. Field areas for physical education and practice can be provided in lieu.
79. Important teamwork skills can be learned outside of sports.
80. Provision of the stadium appears to contradict the “compact schools” concept.
81. The stadium is going to be used only five nights per year and for only a small subset of the student body. The cost is disproportionate and a poor use of taxpayer dollars.
82. Are baseball/softball fields necessary? There are existing sports facilities, including ball fields, at nearby schools that could be shared. Provision of the ball fields appears to contradict the “compact schools” concept. How will ISD ensure play (including foul balls) remains on the campus? “Equity” among sports facilities should not be a priority when there are available facilities for sharing.
83. Can the baseball and softball fields be combined? Modification of the outfield of one field indicates there is room for adjustment. Adjust the size or location further to decrease proximity to Providence Point.
84. Can the baseball and softball fields be relocated westward? The experience of passing motorists should not be more important than the impacts to existing residential communities.
85. A community sports area with all the necessary facilities could be effective and would allow all district schools to share.
86. Were classrooms removed from the building program to provide funding for the stadium? If so, this does not meet the intent of the bond to reduce overcrowding in schools.
87. The stadium and the parking structure should be reversed to provide a larger buffer between residences and the stadium, reducing noise and lighting impacts.
88. The baseball and softball fields are located approximately 40 feet higher in elevation than the neighboring Bellewood community to the north, resulting in noise and light pollution. The retaining wall supporting the baseball and softball fields will be monolithic and will have significant light and shadow impacts on the Bellewood property. How will these impacts be mitigated?

89. The stadium will include lighting that will be clearly visible to Providence Point residents. How will the stadium lights be designed to avoid spillover onto neighboring properties and/or glare into neighboring residential windows? How will lighting be monitored so lights are turned off when not in use? Lighting impacts should be mitigated upon construction, not through new landscaping that needs time to mature. How will the safety of unsupervised evening activities by addressed? Can the City limit off hours use of the school facilities?
90. It is unclear if the baseball/softball fields will include future lighting.
91. Could the high school include a swimming pool (for example, as schools in California do) that can be shared by schools throughout the district?
92. Could a series of smaller play fields at different elevations accommodate grade changes?
93. Could tennis courts, soccer fields, etc. be shared with nearby high schools?
94. The stadium is poorly designed. The long, narrow design leads to poor visibility. Formal spectator stands are only need for football, and informal seating is adequate for all sports. Informal bleachers have a significantly lower environmental impact than the stadium with its permanent stands.

Staff Response:
Applicant Response: The district's voters approved a bond for a fourth comprehensive high school with similar amenities to the other high schools in the district. The track and field, with covered seating, complies with this direction and also meets educational program requirements and school extracurricular needs. The impacts on the educational program at the new and existing schools, lack of availability due to scheduling, traffic impacts, and safety concerns with transporting students to use other facilities in the district makes it infeasible for the project no to include this component. While the seating at the track and field will be fully utilized only a handful of days a year the facility will host numerous smaller sporting events throughout the year as well as be used nearly every day during the school year as part of the educational program. The track and field will be equipped with lights for evening use. The Musco lights employ an optical technology that allows for a fully shielded fixture in which the light source will not be seen from 150' from the fields. For controls, these lights use a control and monitoring system that allows for remote scheduling so that manual switching and keys are not used. The owner can remotely set and change schedules anytime through their online account or by calling into Musco Control-Link®.

The need for the baseball and softball fields are a part of the required educational program but will not include field lighting. The fields will not be combined as it reduces the ability to use them concurrently for boys and girls activities. The fields are stepped from west to east to reduce walls along 228th. Combining the outfields would eliminate the ability to step the fields. Moving the baseball fields closer to 228th would require additional retaining walls and fill to construct. The project is trying to balance earthwork, ADA access requirements, and costs and moving the fields would have impacts on all three items.

As discussed during the Community Conference, the idea to flip the high school parking and track and field was studied extensively during the design. The requirements of the track to be flat eliminates the ability to adjust grades entering the site as currently designed with the parking structure and sloped parking. The result of the flip would be a significant increase in required retaining walls, earthwork, and reduction in usable space. The cost and code impacts of these items makes them infeasible. Furthermore, this would put the high school parking lot in front of

the elementary school and eliminate the buffer between the elementary and high school programs.

Following the community conference, the project team met with the project arborist to walk the site and evaluate trees along the north property line. As part of this meeting it was determined that existing healthy trees and vegetation could be maintained in this area to create existing buffering. The plan along this property line has been altered to reduce grading limits near the property line, save existing trees, and provide additional landscape screening at the field level that was not previously shown.

Conclusion:

Traffic and Access to 228th Avenue SE

95. What is the status of the Traffic Study and City of Sammamish's review comments
96. The project's single ingress/egress plan relies on widening 228th Avenue SE. Widening this road is only included in Sammamish's 20-year Transportation Master Plan and funding is uncertain. If the school is built without widening 228th Avenue SE, will it cause failed concurrency in nearby intersections? How will impacts be mitigated if 228th Avenue SE is not widened
97. The surrounding area lacks transit, pedestrian, and bicycle infrastructure. Discontinuous sidewalks, difficult topography, and high volumes of traffic mean it will be unsafe for children to walk to school. ISD plans to build sidewalks along their 228th Avenue SE frontage; is there a plan to expand the pedestrian accessibility to the site by connecting to South Sammamish park and ride, nearby commercial properties, or nearby neighborhoods?
98. A single ingress/egress seems inadequate for the traffic volume associated with the site. Is only one point of public access for the site feasible?
99. How will the project mitigate the impact to the Providence Point Drive SE ingress/egress onto 228th Avenue SE? What is the relationship of the new signal for this site with the new signal being built at the entrance to Providence Point?
100. Traffic backups on 228th Avenue SE, SE 43rd Way, and on internal access roads need to be addressed in the traffic study. Impacts include increased travel times for non-school users, added pollution from idling vehicles, and safety implications for emergency response during peak traffic.
101. Will the school district prepare a Transportation Management Plan? The City should require this as part of the application.
102. How does the plan encourage students to take school buses rather than drive?
103. Has the fire department approved relocation of the gate at the northeast corner of the new building? Is this access way by used the fire department to exit Providence Point?
104. How will traffic be impacted further away from the site? How far will the road be widened?
105. How will emergency medical response to Providence Point, Bellewood, Spiritwood, Marionwood, and Adult Care Family Home be protected? Fire/aid responses occur several times a day and additional traffic will impact time-sensitive life-saving medical responses.
106. The single access point seems unsafe in a natural disaster, active shooter, or similar site security situation. How will the younger children be handled in such a situation?
107. The traffic analysis should consider new residential projects being constructed nearby.

108. The traffic analysis should consider cut-through traffic in adjacent neighborhoods, especially to the east in Sammamish.
109. Frontage improvements should include their own drainage features.

Staff Response:
Applicant Response: At this time the project's Traffic Study is being revised to address initial comments from the City of Sammamish with an anticipated completion in the fall of 2020. As a result, all reviewed and updated responses to these comments are based on current conditions and not final information. At this time the frontage improvements to 228th are anticipated to include widening of the roadway and a traffic light. These improvements are intended to mitigate the traffic impacts of the project and show that a single access is the correct solution for the site. An emergency access along the south side of the property is proposed but will be gated to limit entry. Further discussion with both Sammamish and Issaquah on the complete mitigation will follow the review of the traffic report. The report will also include study and recommendations for queuing distances for turn lanes, parent drop off and pickup, bus egress, and traffic impacts to surrounding neighborhoods.

The proposed driveway for the school has been located to provide separation from other intersections to ensure that it will not impact their function. The new light at Providence Point is anticipated to mitigate existing traffic concerns that currently exist. The traffic report shows that no additional mitigation to this intersection is needed by the school.

ISD is working with Issaquah to provide a sidewalk connection to the City project at 43rd. At this time additional offsite sidewalks are not proposed. It should be noted that existing sidewalks along 228th Ave. are ¼ mile north and south of the project limits. ISD would welcome the opportunity to work with both Cities to obtain a safe route to school grant for additional sidewalks to the site.

The site has been designed to meet the IMC requirements for parking and the permitting will include a transportation management plan be completed. In order to prioritize bus ridership, the site access has been designed to give buses priority leaving the site with stop signs on all other vehicle movements. This will expedite the bus times and make this a faster option of travel. ISD also charges for student parking which further incentivizes bus ridership.

Conclusion:

Tree Retention

110. A significant number of trees will be removed from the site, but it is unclear from the application materials where existing trees will be retained, where existing trees will be removed, and where new trees will be planted. Will the site be clear-cut? How will the site meet tree retention requirements? How will the project meet replanting requirements? Existing, mature trees should be retained around the entire site, not just primarily on the eastern slopes. Tree preservation should be a priority.
111. The project should retain 30 percent of significant trees consistent with the previous zoning (SF-SL) and surrounding character.
112. It is unclear how the "park-like environment" described by ISD is supported by the removal of so many trees.

113. Loss of vegetation and wildlife habitat will impact the Providence Point community, including at the westernmost "point" of the ISD property, where the school will be closest to the Providence Point community. Most of the mature trees are retained in areas that do not buffer the Providence Point community. Mature trees are an important part of mitigating noise, light, pollution, and aesthetic impacts. How will impacts from loss of vegetation be mitigated?
114. The plan should include larger buffers to protect more trees along the northwest property line. Will the buffer along the northwest property line be filled with existing trees or new plantings?
115. Modification (reduction) of tree retention requirements is not supported by members of the community.
116. Arborist information provided for the community conference is inadequate. The final arborist report is not yet completed.
117. Taller trees should be planted and should be fast-growing and low-maintenance species that do not drop needles, pods, or flowers.
118. Off-site tree mitigation and in lieu fees are inadequate compensation for the loss of so many trees on site.
119. Why is tree retention along 228th instead of along the buffer with Providence Point, moving all the facilities away from the residential community?

Staff Response:
Applicant Response: The proposed site design intends to meet the City's code for reduced minimum tree save by keeping approximately 18-percent of the existing trees along the project boundaries and a larger swath along 228th where the steeper slopes exist. The site layout takes advantage of flatter portions of the site, minimizing large retaining walls and earthwork required. Following grading of the site the disturbed areas will be revegetated with new trees and groundcover. Species of landscaping is being reviewed with an arborist to ensure the new plants survive and minimize required maintenance. These trees will meet the tree replacement requirements for the site and provide additional buffering for the neighboring properties. Tree retention plans, calculations, and an arborist report is being included in the Site Development Plan and Master Site Plan application documents.
Conclusion:

Landscaping

120. What type and height of perimeter fencing/landscaping berm/wall will be used to buffer the schools from residences in the Providence Point community? Is ISD considering a chain-link fence or a solid barrier that will also mitigate noise impacts?
121. How will the proposed berm be constructed? Would ISD plant a screen of eight-foot-high to 10-foot-high Leyland Cyprus to help block noise and light?
122. Larger nursery stock should be provided wherever possible to improve landscaping screening functions.
123. How close to the existing fencing will plantings be placed?
124. How much of the existing natural environment will be retained in order to provide high quality "outdoor learning spaces?" What is the nature of the outdoor learning spaces and how do they provide a "natural learning laboratory" type of function?
125. Retaining walls along the south and east could impact critical areas and create light and shadow impacts.
126. Administrative adjustments to landscaping standards should not be allowed.

Staff Response:
Applicant Response: As required by the IMC, all disturbed portions of the site will be planted. The exact limits of work vary from the property line but retaining existing trees and vegetation where feasible is being done to limit impacts to neighbors and reduce construction costs. As noted above, the project team is working with an arborist to ensure the survivability of retained and proposed trees. There are areas where existing improvements and previous clearing will be removed and replanted near the property line. One example is the existing access road near the northwest property line will be removed. The area will be replanted, and a large earth berm constructed from onsite soils to screen the neighboring views of the site. The site will be replanted with larger stock and fast growing trees where possible based on site constraints and ability to provide additional buffer around existing trees being maintained.

As noted above, the project team is working with an arborist to ensure that existing trees will survive following construction and to meet the City's tree save and replanting requirements onsite. No offsite mitigation is anticipated.

The proposed adjustment to standards is intended to allow existing landscaping to be used to screen the new walls and eliminate screening at the softball field in order to will allow the project to maintain more existing trees along the buffer between the site and the neighbors. Not allowing this adjustment would require removal of existing trees to plant new screening which is not the best decision based on environmental and cost impacts.
Conclusion:

Grading

127. What is the status of the Geotechnical Report? It needs, at a minimum, to describe methods for earthwork, depth of excavation and groundwater management, type of recommended foundation systems, calculation of allowable soil pressure and settlement, parameters for seismic design, etc…
128. The amount of grading to create a flat project site is extraordinary and will negatively impact site features and aesthetics. The site design and layout should use the topography more effectively rather than the extensive use of grading and retaining walls. For example, buildings can "take up grade" and/or the parking structure could be built underground. A reduction in grading on site could save more trees. The grades for the baseball and softball fields are driven by keeping all the dirt on site and not trucking dirt off site.
129. Site development costs resulting from grading will be extreme and are a poor return on investment for ISD taxpayers.

Staff Response:
Applicant Response: Site investigation of subsurface conditions and a geotechnical report have been completed for the site and have been submitted to the City for third party review. The site has been designed to balance earthwork to the fullest extent practical. Stepping the parking structure and elementary school buildings into the hillside to make up grade are great ideas and are being incorporated into the project to reduce onsite walls, increase program area, and reduce project costs.
Conclusion:

Critical Areas

130. What is the status of the Critical Areas Report? The project application should be placed on hold until third-party review of the report is completed.
131. Critical areas and their buffers were not shown or not clearly shown on the materials submitted for the community conference, including:
    a. There is a geologically hazardous area on the property.
    b. The area is considered Lower Tributary Drainage per King County.
    c. There are two wetlands on the property.
    d. There is a critical aquifer recharge area.
132. All critical areas and their buffers should be protected with no reduction
133. The slope south of the Bellewood property appears to be a steep slope critical area.
134. How will the clearing and grading of the site impact critical areas and existing wildlife habitat? Which species are present on the site, and where will they go when this site is cleared and graded? Are there endangered or threatened species, eagles, spotted owls, or others?
135. The Applicant proposes to fill a wetland and offset it by tree retention near a different wetland. How does tree retention meet mitigation requirements for filling in a wetland? How does tree retention provide the same values as the wetland that will be filled?

Staff Response:
Applicant Response: ISD has retained consultants to address the critical areas on the site. These studies are subject to third party review on behalf of the City of Issaquah as part of the permitting process. Based on the review of these studies produced by consultants, the only critical areas on the property are two wetlands. One of the wetlands is associated with a roadside ditch that is intended to be impacted and mitigated in accordance with IMC requirements. The other wetland and its buffer will be preserved and used for educational purposes. For the aquifer recharge area, a full discussion of the stormwater system is included in that section of the comments. In summary, storm water will be given the opportunity to infiltrate but due to onsite soils it is not anticipated that a large volume of runoff will infiltrate. There are not designated steep slope area or known endangered or threatened species.
Conclusion:

Noise

136. The schools will generate noise (from on-site and off-site traffic, sports events, playground use/recess and other outdoor activities during school hours, etc.) that will impact Providence Point residents. What are the anticipated noise levels that Providence Point will experience? How long will noise last each day? How are the noise impacts going to be identified and mitigated?
137. What noise mitigation will be provided for mechanical (HVAC) units on the elementary school?
138. Site traffic will create early morning and afternoon noise on 228th Avenue SE and along the internal access road. What noise mitigation strategies are proposed?
139. Evening and late-night games will create noise. What noise mitigation strategies are proposed?
140. A noise study should be required to assess all noise impacts including those from traffic, construction, operation, mechanical equipment, activities on site, sporting events, PA systems, and outside play areas.

Staff Response:

Applicant Response: ISD and the design team have been working to reduce potential noise concerns and meet the IMC noise requirements as part of the design. As a part of this work sound levels at properties adjacent to the schools were calculated using a 3-D computer model. Noise generating sources included on-site traffic, mechanical and electrical equipment, loading docks, the school bus lot, noise emitting from the Scene Shop garage door, covered seating, and the track and field. Sound levels reaching Providence Point are anticipated to comply with daytime and nighttime sound level limits set for in the Issaquah Municipal Code. Mitigation measures included in the design are:

- Noise barriers around some rooftop mechanical units on the high school and elementary school
- Orienting field seating and speakers for the track and field to project sound away from Providence Point and towards 228th
- Site calibration of PA system for track and field after installation to adjust levels and speaker orientation
- ISD control of field use to limit hours as necessary to control noise

The noise study for the site will be included in the Master Site Plan application documents.
Conclusion:

Stormwater and Drainage

141. Students are incorrectly identified as “employees” in the drainage narrative. Considering students to be employees appears to reduce the stormwater treatment requirements from “enhanced” to “basic,” which should not be allowed.
142. The project will result in a significant amount of stormwater runoff. Detailed calculations and plans must be provided. The Drainage Narrative indicates that any new stormwater management system will reduce existing and historic runoff events from the site; this must be supported with data. The drainage report must include information documenting the total increase in runoff from the site resulting from the proposal.
143. The project should provide enhanced stormwater treatment as authorized and encouraged within the adopted stormwater manual.
144. What is the impact of more stormwater runoff on Laughing Jacobs Creek, Lake Sammamish, kokanee populations, and other fish and wildlife habitat/populations? Thorough analysis is expected.
145. The application indicates that some amount of storm drainage will be routed into Providence Point’s aging stormwater system. How is this allowed? What will the impacts to this system be?
146. Can drainage be routed down to the culverts in 228th Avenue SE and SE 43rd Way instead? There is an existing “spillover” system that should be utilized.
147. Would stormwater routed through the Providence Point system be adequately treated in accordance with current stormwater standards?
148. There appears to be inadequate analysis of low impact development opportunities to reduce stormwater runoff.
149. The Drainage Narrative indicates there are “no road intersections proposed on the site,” but there are clearly intersections between internal access roadways.
150. The Drainage Narrative indicates an overflow system from the southwest basin will discharge to an existing storm system in 228th Avenue SE. A description of downstream facilities must be provided. Information on how the flows will interact with the natural drainage basin must be provided.

151. The Drainage Narrative indicates that the northeast basin will discharge to 228th Avenue SE. A description of downstream facilities and potential volume must be provided. This information should be combined with information regarding runoff from planned transportation improvements.
152. Stormwater in the northeast basin will flow into the City of Sammamish and must comply with the Sammamish stormwater manual.

Staff Response:
Applicant Response: The project is proposing to meet the stormwater requirements as adopted by the City of Issaquah. A geotechnical investigation and report were completed for the site and notes that infiltration is not recommended for stormwater runoff control based on the lack of a suitable infiltration receptor. However, as noted in the critical areas discussion above, stormwater will be given an opportunity to infiltrate into the ground prior to releasing from the site. As part of the construction the project will collect, detain stormwater runoff to match pre-developed rates (forested condition), and treat all stormwater from pollution generating surfaces prior to leaving the site. Based on the downstream critical areas associated with Laughing Jacobs Creek and Lake Sammamish the project has elected to provide enhanced treatment and phosphorus removal prior to discharge. This treatment will utilize mechanical treatment cartridges. Discussions with King County's Kokanee Recovery Manager and a local Kokanee Work Group are being scheduled to discuss any potential negative impacts to the Kokanee and get further recommendations for mitigation if necessary.

The site has been designed with several low impact development techniques being utilized. As the design develops further, additional low impact development technics will be evaluated/provided. A list of low impact development technics currently provided in the design are:

- Pervious surface for track
- Vegetated conveyance swales to provide additional treatment and mimic existing conditions
- Minimize parking area by using compact stalls and structured parking
- Minimize disturbed area by condensing site program and not constructing additional practice fields or other less utilized areas
- Maintaining perimeter buffer areas around the site in existing, forested condition.

As part of the design of the stormwater system the project will discharge a large portion of the southwest basin of the site out to the City stormwater system in 228th. This change in discharge location will not change the ultimate downstream path for stormwater but will avoid discharging additional water to the Providence Point Stormwater system. The project will reduce the historic flows from the existing site to the downstream Providence Point System. Conveyance analyses of the alternative downstream shows that the system is adequately sized for the additional stormwater runoff.

A preliminary stormwater report outlining the entire storm system will be included in the MSP and SDP submittal packages.
Conclusion:

Community Amenities

153. Will there be facilities/amenities on the site available for public access? For example, will Providence Point residents be allowed to walk the track when it is not in use? The intent is for the site to be available for public use similar to other ISD facilities.
154. Has ISD explored the possibility of adding community facilities such as a dog park?
155. Will there be an opportunity for native plant stewardship groups to salvage native plants from the site before construction?

Staff Response:
Applicant Response: At this time ISD intends to operate this school similar to other schools in the district with community access to the playfield areas. This will allow the district to limit hours of use, track usage, and ensure that the site remains secure. No additional space or budget for additional program or amenities is available. The school district will work with local stewardship groups to allow the salvage of native plants prior to construction.
Conclusion:

Other Comments and Questions ISD and Denise

156. How will construction impacts be identified and mitigated? Construction will be completed per IMC requirements for work hours and mitigation.
157. Why and how was this site chosen? Thirty-six acres of developable land does not seem to be enough for all of the programmatic elements. It appears that a major reason for the difficulty in finding an appropriate site is ISD's insistence on including a stadium and extensive sports facilities in the program.
158. The application materials lack important details, including professional/technical reports, additional sections showing views of all buildings/facilities from Providence Point, arborist/tree removal information, berm details, and similar information.
159. Three-dimensional renderings of project from alternative viewpoints, especially the Providence Point side, would help residents see the scope of the project. A view of the elementary school site is needed.
160. What neighborhoods will this school pull students from? How are school enrollment boundaries determined and when will that information be available for the schools in this project?
161. Will this new school raise property taxes and/or lower property values?
162. How is ISD working with the Providence Point community to identify and mitigate impacts?
163. ISD enrollment is not increasing as quickly as originally estimated and there is not an immediate need for Elementary School No. 17. This project could be postponed, leaving the land undisturbed.
164. Is an asbestos/PCB remediation report from building demolition included as part of the application materials, and is it satisfactory?
165. Existing compact schools regulations were adopted after ISD acquired the property and were completed with the current site and proposed schools in mind.
166. There is a great need to carefully plan for trails, road crossing points, and the use of the few remaining natural areas for educational purposes.

Staff Response:
Applicant Response: The District worked with a professional real estate broker over a period of years to identify property suitable for the needed schools. King County in 2012 amended the Countywide Planning Policies and prohibited the siting of new schools outside of the Urban Growth Boundary. This action eliminated the District's ability to use an existing land banked 80-

acre rural site and effectively eliminated from consideration for future schools roughly 70% of the District's land area (65,000 acres total, of which 22,000 is designated urban). The District's broker determined that, of the 22,000 acres within the Urban Growth Boundary, the available acreage drops to only a few hundred acres after deducting for sensitive areas, developed and fully utilized properties, publicly held properties (Community Facilities, Parks), and other development constraints (restricted utility extensions, isolated small acreage, etc.). The District's broker searched extensively throughout the District's urban area, focusing on all available developable land in locations near school populations and identified service area needs. He estimates reviewing close to 700 acres of potentially workable school sites and then, after eliminating some of those parcels based upon development constraints, conducted a more focused review of potentially viable school sites. The broker's work considered the City's compact schools guidelines and, given urban land constraints, nontraditional and smaller sites. The Project site was the only viable site within the urban area of the District for a high school program and, at that time, was being marketed for development at its highest best use of approximately 140 single family homes.

At this time the need for these schools and additional capacity within the district has not changed. Following the opening of these schools updated boundaries will be drawn to define which neighborhoods these schools will draw from but they are intended to surround the project site and reduce the number of students at existing overcrowded neighboring schools.

Additional details regarding construction practices, three-dimensional renderings, project materials will be included in future permit submittals.

Conclusion: